DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 905 IR 050 788

TITLE	Public/Private Sector Interactions: The Implications for Networking. A Discussion Report Prepared by the Network Advisory Committee.
INSTITUTION	Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Network Development Office.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-8444-0438-1
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	53p.; Proceedings of a Program Meeting held October 25-27, 1982. For related document, see ED 215 678.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402; and/or Customer Services Section, Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20541.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT	Network Planning Paper; n8 1983
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Government Role; *Information Networks; *Information Services; Interaction; Online Systems; Preservation; *Private Agencies; *Public Agencies; Public Policy; Reference Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Access to Information; Library of Congress; National Commission Libraries Information Science; *Networking; Private Sector; Public Sector

ABSTRACT

At a 2-day meeting in October 1982, the Library of Congress Network Advisory Committee (NAC) members discussed the complex issues involved in public and private sector interactions and their relationship to networking activities. The report, "Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction in Providing Information Services," prepared by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force, was used as a core document. In addition, NAC commissioned a concept paper by Glyn Evans, Executive Director, SUNY/OCLC. Discussion groups were formed to explore how the principles and recommendations of the report to NCLIS related to special services provided by either a public or private sector agency. The groups concluded that while equity of access and preservation were of concern, these services could, with appropriate safeguards, be supplied by either sector. In addition to the report of the meeting, this document includes a list of the NAC members, an executive summary, and four appendices: (1) a background reading list; (2) a review and summary of the NCLIS task force report by Robert M. Hayes of the University of California, Los Angeles; (3) Glyn Evans' discussion paper; and (4) an outline of NAC actions on the NCLIS task force report. (DMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246905

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ISSN 0160-9742

NETWORK PLANNING PAPER

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

NUMBER 8

DATE 1983

TITLE Public/Private Sector Interactions
The Implications for Networking

A Discussion Report Prepared by the
Network Advisory Committee

Library of Congress

Washington

IR050788
IR050788

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Network Advisory Committee.
Public/private sector interactions.

(Network planning paper, ISSN 0160-9742 ; no. 8)
Proceedings of a program meeting held Oct. 25-27, 1982.
Includes bibliographical references.
Supt. of Docs. no.: LC 30.24: 8
1. Library information networks--United States--Congresses. 2. Information networks--United States--Congresses. 3. Information services and state--United States--Congresses. 4. Government information--United States--Congresses. I. Title. II. Series.
Z674.8.N46 1983 025'.04 83-600284
ISBN 0-8444-0438-1 (pbk.)

Available from the Customer Services Section, Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20541.

CONTENTS

		Page
	FOREWORD	1
	PREFACE	2
	NETWORK ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	4
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1.	INTRODUCTION	8
2.	PROGRAM STRUCTURE	10
3.	WORKING GROUP SESSIONS	12
4.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19

APPENDIXES

A.	Background Readings	22
B.	A Commentary on the NCLIS Public Sector/ Private Sector Task Force and Its Report	23
C.	A Discussion Paper Presented to the Network Advisory Committee on the Public Sector/ Private Sector Task Force Report	31
D.	NAC Actions on NCLIS Task Force Report	42

FOREWORD

The Network Advisory Committee devoted its October 25-27, 1982 program meeting to a discussion of public/private sector interaction in areas related to library networking. Because of the complex nature of the issues and the potentially polarizing and, therefore, inconclusive results that could have occurred, the fact that this session ended on a positive note can be attributed to the excellent preparation done by the program planning subcommittee (Mary Ellen Jacob, chair, Henriette Avram, Brett Butler, Wallace Olsen, Barbara Robinson, and Ward Shaw). In addition, the efforts of Ms. Jacob, Ms. Robinson, and Sandra Paul in compiling this report and the support of the Council on Library Resources are gratefully acknowledged.

This document has been officially transmitted to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. It should be noted that the opinions expressed in this report are those of the Network Advisory Committee acting collectively as a body and not necessarily those of the individual organizations represented on the committee.

Henriette D. Avram, Chair
Network Advisory Committee

26 August 1983

PREFACE

The Library of Congress Network Advisory Committee is composed of individuals who represent organizations in both the public and private sectors that are in the library and/or information science field. Organizations represented on NAC include: national and professional membership associations, trade and institutional associations, national libraries/federal information agencies, national bibliographic networks, regional special bibliographic system operators, network service organizations, national reference systems, and selected individual library systems.

NAC's primary role is to serve as an advisory committee to the Library of Congress (as its title states) on library and information networking activities external to LC which will affect its present and future services and to react to LC plans and strategies for providing services to those sectors and institutions represented by NAC. In addition, NAC serves as a sounding board and forum for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, provides input to the Council on Library Resources on the design and development of a nationwide network, and generally serves as the principal forum on national network planning and policy. NAC's function in every case is to discuss and clarify issues, raise matters of concern, and when appropriate, recommend actions to LC, CLR, or NCLIS but not to take direct action itself.

NAC represents an unparalleled resource to these agencies by providing expert advice on library networking. Members of NAC come not only as representatives of the institutions they represent officially but also as highly articulate, knowledgeable individuals in the field of networking and library automation. They are typically opinion leaders in their organizations and in their professions. As such, NAC's influence as a forum for discussion is far more pervasive than suggested by the two or three meetings it holds in a year. The exchange of opinions within the NAC meetings and communication of that information back to their professional colleagues in organizations and institutions throughout the United States have been invaluable for all concerned.

Program sessions are valued by NAC members because they provide a rare opportunity to step back from the demands of each individual NAC member's institutional perspective and review issues relating to networking on a broader level with the benefit of discussion and directed reading. Some of the issues that have been covered over the past years include: ownership and distribution of bibliographic data,1/ governance and development of a national network,2/ and document delivery. Reports have been made at the conferences of the American Library Association and the American Society for Information Science, and various papers have been published, including the most recent report, Document Delivery--Background Papers Commissioned by the Network Advisory Committee.3/

The present paper is an outgrowth of NAC members' concern with the complex issues involved with public and private sector interactions and their relationship to networking activities. The reasons for this concern, the NAC program on this topic, and the conclusions drawn are described. This report is not intended to be a definitive analysis of any of the cases mentioned but rather to identify and highlight issues of concern in library networking, to aid in understanding the issues, and to prompt further consideration by colleagues and researchers. We hope that the report highlights both means and ends, recognizing

that these may be quite different. There may also be a variety of ways to achieve desirable goals, and in certain contexts, multiple means may be appropriate.

REFERENCES

1/ Duane E. Webster and Lenore S. Maruyama, Ownership and Distribution of Bibliographic Data; Highlights of a Meeting Held by the Library of Congress Network Advisory Committee, March 4-5, 1980. (Washington: Library of Congress, Dec. 1980. Rev. May 1981). 17 p. Available by request from the LC Cataloging Distribution Service, Customer Services Section, Washington, D.C. 20541.

2/ A Nationwide Network: Development, Governance, Support; Discussion Paper Resulting from a Meeting Held by the . . . Network Advisory Committee, October 1-2, 1980. (Washington: Library of Congress, Jan. 1981. Rev. May 1981). 15 p. Also available from the Cataloging Distribution Service.

3/ Document Delivery--Background Papers Commissioned by the Network Advisory Committee. (Washington: Library of Congress, 1982). 1 v. (various pagings). Issued as Network Planning Paper no. 7 and available from the Cataloging Distribution Service.

NETWORK ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Member Organizations

American Library Association

Member: Joseph Shubert (New York State Library)
Alternate: Carol Henderson (ALA Washington Office)

American Society for Information Science

Member: Ward Shaw (Colorado Alliance for Research Libraries)

AMIGOS Bibliographic Council

Member: James H. Kennedy
Alternate: Paul Vassallo (University of New Mexico Library)

Association of American Publishers

Member: Sandra K. Paul (SKP Associates)
Alternate: Thomas D. McKee

Association of Research Libraries

Member: William J. Studer (Ohio State University Libraries)
Alternate: Susan K. Martin (Johns Hopkins University Library)

Bibliographical Center for Research

Member: JoAn Segal
Alternate: Anne Marie Falsone (Office of Library Services, Colorado Dept. of Education)

Chief Officers of State Library Agencies

Member: Anthony W. Miele (Alabama Public Library Service)
Alternate: Anne Marie Falsone (Office of Library Services, Colorado Dept. of Education)

Cooperative Library Agency for Systems and Services

Member: Ronald F. Miller

Federal Library Committee

Member: James P. Riley

Information Industry Association

Member: Brett Butler (Information Access Corp.)
Alternate: Betty Davis (Pergamon International)

Institute for Scientific Information

Member: Thomas G. DiRenzo
Alternate: Richard Kollin

Library of Congress

Chairman: Henriette D. Avram

Medical Library Association

Member: Erika Love (University of New Mexico Medical Center Library)

Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange

Member:

National Agricultural Library

Member: Wallace Olsen

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Member: Toni Carbo Bearman

National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services

Member: James Wood (Chemical Abstracts Service)

National Library of Medicine

Member: Lois Ann Colaianni

NELINET, Inc.

Member: Laima Mockus

OCLC, Inc.

Member: Mary Ellen Jacob
Alternate: Paul Schrank

Research Libraries Group

Member: C. James Schmidt

Southeastern Library Network

Member: Frank P. Grisham

Special Libraries Association

Member: Barbara Robinson

University of Chicago

Member: Martin Runkle
Alternate: Charles Payne

Washington Library Network

Member: Roderick G. Swartz
Alternate: Ray DeBuse

Observers

American Association of Law Libraries

Betty Taylor (University of Florida Law Library)

Carnegie Corporation of New York

Richard Greene

Council on Library Resources

Warren J. Haas
C. Lee Jones

National Endowment for the Humanities

Jeffrey Field

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At a two-day meeting in October 1982, the Network Advisory Committee discussed the implications of public/private sector interaction in networking. The report, Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction In Providing Information Services prepared by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force, was used as a core document. In addition, NAC commissioned a concept paper by Glyn Evans, Executive Director, SUNY/OCLC.

Small discussion groups were formed to explore in detail how the principles and recommendations of the report to NCLIS related to special services provided by either a public or private sector agency. The groups concluded that while equity of access and preservation were of concern, these services could, with appropriate safeguards, be supplied by either sector. Appendix D contains a summary of NAC views on the NCLIS task force recommendations. NAC also recommended the following:

- NCLIS should prepare an inventory of past and current projects that have demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of public and private sector interaction, identify what made those particular projects successful, and develop guidelines for promoting or funding similar projects in the future.

- NCLIS should review its existing reports, in particular, the results of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, to identify potential projects which would promote and encourage public/private sector interaction.

- NAC should report on its activities and on this particular discussion to the profession through sessions at different conferences.

- NAC should gather the related information for its meeting and prepare a network planning paper with its concept paper and background information to encourage and promote discussion of the important issues raised in the NCLIS task force report.

1. INTRODUCTION

Some issues in the library profession are perennial. They are discussed for a time, fade from view, and come again. Such an area of concern is public/private sector interaction. Most recently it was raised in regard to the information community in two different ways. One was the change in Federal regulatory policy, and the second was through the issuance by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science of a task force report, Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction in Providing Information Services.1/ Initial response to this report has been mixed, some of it highly critical of the way certain issues were discussed or avoided.

Consequently at the October 1982 program session, the Network Advisory Committee chose to discuss this report in the context of networking concerns. The report was produced by a task force appointed by NCLIS, which was composed of twenty-one members representing an array of private sector (for-profit and not-for-profit) and Federal government information producers, as well as two library school deans, one library school faculty member, the director of the John Crerar Library, one state librarian, and two NCLIS commissioners. One-third of the task force was drawn from the for-profit sector, one-third from the not-for-profit sector, and one-third represented Federal, state, and local government.

The Network Advisory Committee was particularly interested in the subject of the task force's report to NCLIS for a number of reasons. At previous program sessions, the advisory committee had struggled with the issue of ownership and distribution of data and had recognized the complexity of the issue and the economic implications in the late 1970s. Similarly, it had been involved in discussions on the issue of whether there should be a monolithic national network for delivering services to libraries and had concluded that diversity and decentralization of services were more desirable than an orderly but rigid superstructure.

In the process of developing a proposal in 1982 on the subject of document delivery, the same need for diversity and a mix of public and private support services also became apparent to the advisory committee. Furthermore, a number of NAC members, also directors of public sector network service organizations, had worked productively with companies in the private sector to deliver network services to their constituents. They felt that their positive experiences demonstrated that cooperation and collaboration were both possible and practicable. Finally, the advisory committee concluded from these earlier sessions that a key issue in private/public sector interaction was how to price and package information, a topic it wanted to explore in more depth.

The Network Advisory Committee places a high value on public/private sector interaction and has attempted to increase private sector participation on the committee in recent years. The newest member, the Institute for Scientific Information in Philadelphia, is the first in the category of an operator of a national reference system, i.e., a computer-based, publicly available information service containing bibliographic and other machine-readable data where the contents are created by the system or provided to it by data base publishers and where its users ordinarily do not modify the data base provided.

The report prepared by the NCLIS Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force had been given to NAC members at the March 1982 meeting by Toni Carbo

Bearman, Executive Director of NCLIS. Ms. Bearman explained that the report had been received but not yet "accepted" by the commissioners of NCLIS. Most of the members had read a critique of the report by Patricia Glass Schuman in the June 1, 1982 issue of Library Journal; consequently, they believed the report merited a full and objective review and planned the next program session of NAC, scheduled for October 1982, around the NCLIS task force report.

REFERENCE

1/ National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force, Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction in Providing Information Services. (Washington: NCLIS, Feb. 1982). 88 p.

2. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

When the Network Advisory Committee agreed to discuss the NCLIS Public/Private Sector Task Force report, Public Sector/Private Sector Interaction In Providing Information Services, it was anxious to avoid debate on the issue of fee versus free information services. Service charges are only one element, and while important, may overshadow other critical issues. Secondly, the advisory committee agreed that the critique of the report should focus on those issues related or of importance to library networking.

For this session, objectives of the Network Advisory Committee were to identify missing areas in the report, identify problems of interpretation or application, identify any areas relative to networking requiring action by the advisory committee, publish a summary of the meeting along with the concept paper and working group reports, and present the results of the discussion at various professional conferences.

2.1 TASK FORCE REPORT

Consequently, it was decided the program should provide a review and summary of the NCLIS report itself. The chairman of the Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force, Dean Robert Hayes, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles, was asked to serve as a resource person during this session to provide background material and clarification as well as to respond to questions the committee members might have. In addition to asking Dean Hayes to respond, NAC commissioned a paper by Glyn Evans, Executive Director of SUNY/OCLC, which would identify deficiencies within the report and highlight those issues of major concern to NAC members on networking. NAC members were sent several background papers (see Appendix A), including Pat Schuman's article and a transcript of an earlier talk that Dean Hayes gave at the Association of Research Libraries' annual meeting on the task force report (see Appendix B). In his talk to ARL, Dean Hayes highlighted several important items which the task force consciously excluded from consideration in the report:

> "The focus of our work must be made clear, since the title of the Task Force does not adequately define that focus. In fact, we were concerned totally with what we called 'governmentally distributed information,' but really federally distributable information."
>
> "The area of international data flow is one in which public sector/private sector interaction is clearly of immense importance, but the Task Force did not feel that it had sufficient expertise in its membership or time with which to cover the issues adequately."
>
> "...issues related to private copyright conflicts, to conflicts between different private information activities, and to conflicts between the providers and the purchasers of information services were not considered unless they involved the government itself as a party to those conflicts."

Having stated these caveats to the ARL members, Dean Hayes went on to discuss the composition of the task force:

> "The distribution of philosophical views concerning the role of government covered literally the complete spectrum, from those who would claim that the government should do nothing in the area of information distribution, literally nothing, to those who would regard the distribution of information as an essential function of government and that government should be able to make decisions to distribute information if it is in the public interest to do so. Between these two polar views would be virtually any other view of the relationship between the public sector and the private sector of which you can conceive."

Dean Hayes said to the ARL membership:

> "I would like to make a personal comment which does not reflect the Task Force in any sense, but my own observation as chairman. The private sector members of the Task Force were very articulate, very forceful, and had a very firm grasp of what they wished to accomplish. The public sector and not-for-profit members of the Task Force were somewhat less forceful, less articulate, and less in agreement on the values related to their concern. I think that the results reflect that relative degree of ability to articulate and present views forcefully."

NAC concluded, as Dean Hayes noted, that the overall tone of the report and its seven principles were heavily influenced by the private sector members.

2.2 CONCEPT PAPER

Glyn Evans presented his discussion paper, commissioned by the Network Advisory Committee for the October program session (see Appendix C). He noted that the task force did not define the parameters of "information," did not collect data in support of some of the principles and recommendations, did not grapple with international data flow problems, did not examine copyright issues, and most importantly, chose to define the problem in narrow terms. Only the Federal government/private sector interaction is discussed in the report, not the larger questions of not-for-profit/profit/governmental (all levels) interactions. Evans called for the development of an economic model "to assess the value of improved service" provided by the regional library networks. He criticized the task force for having overlooked the role of these regional and national networks in their report and for failing to recognize their importance as technology transfer agents and brokers of private and public sector services.

3. WORKING GROUP SESSIONS

Following the presentations by Hayes and Evans, the Network Advisory Committee formed smaller working groups to consider two case studies which were selected because they provided an opportunity to compare a service provided by the Federal government with one offered by the private sector. One case was the development and availability of MARC and REMARC files and the second, the document delivery services provided by the National Technical Information Service and the Institute for Scientific Information.

The working groups were asked to compare and contrast the two services by evaluating:

- What each service was and how comparable each was in terms of the services, facilities, or features provided?
- What the products and services were?
- For whom those products and services were intended?
- What other uses could be made of the products or services?
- How were they accessed?
- How were users charged for use of the product or service?
- Were there alternatives to these products or services?
- What barriers existed to using these services?
- Were there any limitations or restrictions on the service or product?
- What were the advantages of the particular service or product?

In particular, the groups tried to contrast these services by considering whether it made any difference that this particular service was provided by a public or private agency. The working groups also looked at the services in relation to the matrix given in the NCLIS report which also appears in Dean Hayes' remarks in Appendix B.

3.1 MARC/REMARC COMPARISONS

Two working groups independently analyzed the cases of MARC, an example of a public sector service, and REMARC, an example of a private sector service. MARC is the subscription service of machine-readable cataloging records provided by the Library of Congress, principally of materials cataloged by LC. It is available on a subscription basis. A subscriber may acquire all MARC records or those for a particular format, e.g., serials or monographs, or certain subcategories, e.g., English books. There is no selective record service. Records may be new or deletions or changes for previously issued records. No restrictions presently exist on the reuse or copying of MARC records.1/

The REMARC service evolved from an agreement with Carrollton Press to convert Library of Congress shelflist records primarily from 1940 until the start of the MARC subscription service. LC agreed to distribute via MARC no more than 15,000 of these updated records in any one-year period. Carrollton Press retained the right to distribute the updated records. Several different distribution mechanisms have been used, including a selective service allowing libraries to acquire single records via Library of Congress card number. While libraries may use the records for internal systems, contractual restrictions have been placed on redistribution or copying by other libraries.

The two were contrasted using the factors described above. The results of this analysis appears in Table 3-1 at the end of this section.

The model presented in the NCLIS task force report, "Schematic of Contexts for Conflict Concerning the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Information Resources, Products, & Services" was also studied to determine if it was helpful in analyzing the two cases. It did not seem applicable and was not useful in this analysis.

The services, MARC and REMARC, were found to be quite similar and complementary since each covers a somewhat different time frame. Both offer a core of MARC format records which can be used for a variety of purposes. The audience for both MARC and REMARC is the same: large libraries as opposed to small public libraries. The alternatives to either the MARC or REMARC services, i.e., each institution creating its own machine-readable files or contracting with others for such files, were also identified. For REMARC it was assumed that the demand was for machine-readable equivalents of cataloging records in one's own library.

For the REMARC service, the following effects result from restrictions on "follow-on" products: (1) Users cannot share the records with others except on business terms set by the vendor; (2) each online catalog would be independent of others (the possibility of group contracts was raised to counteract this); and (3) the results may not fit into national planning.

Also, for REMARC, the lack of quality control would have the following results: (1) Upgrading of the records would not be available to other REMARC users; (2) authority control would be lacking within an institution's catalog;2/ and (3) duplicate records might remain undetected in an institution's catalog.

REMARC represents a private (for-profit) sector service in an area where the need exists. Although the public sector agency (the Library of Congress) had attempted to undertake large-scale retrospective conversion through its RECON (Retrospective Conversion) and COMARC (Cooperative MARC) pilot projects, it was not able to obtain the necessary funding from Congress to continue these efforts on an operational basis. A service like REMARC tends to serve the needs of individual institutions rather than networks. REMARC could also complicate networking activities because decision-making is moved to a local level, possibly without considering the needs of the larger group of institutions or resource sharing.

Conclusions reached by the working groups were:

- One cannot generalize about the relative merits of services provided by the public sector as opposed to the private sector; there is a need to discuss the problems and issues on a case-by-case basis.
- There is diversity of opinion in both the public and private sectors on many issues, particularly costing and pricing.
- Private sector activities, which are market-driven in both the for-profit and not-for-profit agencies, will continue independent of network planning.
- These market-driven developments may not provide tutorial and planning functions that are ideal factors in network development; therefore, the Network Advisory Committee should continue to support dialogue among the three sectors (public, not-for-profit, and profit).
- One principal result of these activities is that decision-making is decentralized and placed at an institutional level. Network development is also decentralized.
- There is usually stronger management control over the development process in the private sector than in the public sector.
- Public/private sector dialogue on issues is needed before, not after, the event.
- Government competition will always be a sensitive area, particularly if prices set by government reflect only part of the cost and does not reflect true cost.
- One should look for areas of mutual interest between the public and private.
- One cannot always assume that the government has our best interests in mind.

Questions raised were many but related primarily to three major areas. Basic to these is where do the responsibilities lie: with the public, the private, or both sectors?

- Who is responsible for the archive and preservation functions?
- Who is responsible for funding research?
- How are decisions made to drop a service or product?

3.2 DOCUMENT DELIVERY COMPARISON

Document delivery services provided by the National Technical Information Service (public sector) and the Institute for Scientific Information (private, for-profit sector) were contrasted by another working group. Many of the same factors and considerations raised by the MARC/REMARC comparison were also raised.

There will always be differences of opinion as to whether, in a society based on the private enterprise system which assumes government involvement in social welfare and the common good, any given information service should be provided by the government or the private sector. After reviewing the two services, both NTIS and ISI were found to hold large amounts of little-used information, i.e., having a large number of titles, only a few of which are requested in significant numbers. The private sector, however, can discard more readily because it is not forced by law or regulation to preserve materials.

The differences between the two services were noted as follows:

- The apparent cost of government products and services is lower because of indirect subsidies which are not generally available to the private sector.
- The political process enables issues related to social values to be raised before a government service is discontinued in total or in part, whereas the private sector relies on market-driven decisions.
- Services are already available from the public sector, or high entry cost might preclude start-up by the private sector, reducing competition and possibly dampening innovation.

With regard to these two services, the conclusion reached was that there was no compelling reason for government intervention as long as policies were established which would provide for continuity and availability of services including functions like preservation. It was also mentioned, however, that since many of the technical reports handled by NTIS are submitted on a voluntary basis, it, as a government agency, probably has more clout than a private sector organization to "encourage" federal agencies and private contractors to send materials to NTIS.

3.3 SUMMARY

The Network Advisory Committee concluded that the confrontations between the public and private sectors on issues like copyright or the National Periodicals Center led to the NCLIS task force report, which produced few surprising results. U.S. information resources are rich and based on mutual public/private sector development that will continue, and NCLIS could improve the effectiveness of its role as adviser to the Executive Branch by supporting and funding a series of pilot projects that would demonstrate the results of cooperation between the sectors. NCLIS should review its prior reports and the recommendations of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services to identify useful pilot projects, and the Network Advisory Committee could assist by identifying those projects that relate to networking.

One of the primary conclusions of the working group sessions was that in comparing one type of service available from two different sources, one public and one private, the fact that the service was provided by a public or private agency did not cause any substantial problems. The services studied could be provided in either way. There would be some differences in pricing and availability, but provision by the private sector did not create insurmountable barriers although it might raise questions of subsidy for certain groups to ensure equity of access. It presented no difficulties of an insurmountable nature for networking activities per se, although some questions were raised regarding the availability of third party use of the REMARC records and the rate at which LC will be able to incorporate REMARC records into the MARC subscription service.

REFERENCES

1/ For the subscription year beginning April 1, 1983, the Library of Congress has instituted an agreement that states: "The Customer will not copy nor redistribute the LC MARC tapes in the form received under this subscription to another party. The Customer may copy or redistribute/on a record by record basis to another party only those MARC records which have been modified or otherwise claimed for local cataloging use."

2/ Carrollton Press has subsequently offered as an option the running of REMARC records selected by a user against the name and subject authority system of Blackwell North America.

TABLE 3-1
Comparison of MARC/REMARC

Factors	MARC	REMARC
Content:	Database maintained and updated. 2,000,000 records 1968-	One-time snapshot 5,000,000 records 1940-67 English; 1940-78 Non-English 2,000,000 MARC records
Size:	Much smaller than REMARC	Much bigger than MARC
Quality:	High	?
Completeness:	High	?
By-products/Use:	Unlimited; high quality	Limited by contract; quality unknown
How sold:	Subscription	Per transaction/unit of cataloging (batch) with Apple computer on loan; online through Dialog
Agency:	Database maintained by LC (a public agency)	Database under private control
Distribution:	Distributed wholesale by LC; distributed retail by various agents: public and private (not-for-profit and for-profit)	Distributed wholesale and retail by Carrollton Press, Dialog
Fullness:	Full MARC records	Not full MARC records
Quality Control:	Quality control present because of internal LC needs.	No quality control: designed to meet market demand (records not available through public sector service)
Funding:	Public funding	Private capital to develop public resource
Restrictions:	No restrictions on re-use1/ Very costly for one institution to maintain entire file	Restricted re-use Contract limitations; quality of database; unknown cost to correct and up-date

Factors	MARC	REMARC
	Average price $.45 per record for current subscription. Full subscription price depends on frequency and portion selected.	$.50 REMARC $.20 MARC records
Access:	Online (using one's own system and the subscription tapes): OCLC, RLIN, WLN, Mini-MARC, etc	Online: Dialog file
	Batch; COM vendors, etc.	Batch: Vendor matches records in batch mode after user inputs card number on diskette or tape
Alternatives:**	Input yourself from NUC copy	
	Bibliographic utilities (OCLC, RLIN, WLN, etc.), OCLC retrospective record cost is $.15/record	Bibliographic utilities EKI and other keyboarding firms
	COM or other vendors (BNA, et al)	COM vendors
Advantages:		No other source has scope; LC gets machine-readable records, thereby facilitating its own research operations. Seen as more useful for reference use than for cataloging

**Depends on intended use, e.g., reference, acquisitions, cataloging, etc.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Public/private sector interactions are many and varied. The Network Advisory Committee reviewed some of these in the working group discussions of the services provided by LC, Carrollton Press, NTIS, and ISI. There are others that could be used as examples. We have different approaches to obtaining information and access from the telephone system. The white pages present a fairly straightforward alphabetical listing of telephone subscribers. The yellow pages present quite a different approach to information, primarily to businesses and services by providing categorization or indexing by subject/service. Entries in the white pages generally are provided by being a subscriber to the telephone company, although additional listings can be provided at additional cost. On the other hand, appearance in the yellow pages is primarily an advertising service, and an institution has an option of deciding what type and how much information will be displayed in the yellow pages.

One can look at the kinds of services being provided between the public and private sectors in similar ways. Many of the services offered by the private sector represent a value-added or enhancement of services, whereas the government services tend to be more of the bread and butter, plain vanilla variety without necessarily all the additional value-added features or enhancements.

Similar differences in approach can be seen in the MARC/REMARC services where the MARC service provided by the Library of Congress is a tape subscription service, while the REMARC service allows a record selection option to libraries and some enhancement of the record with local data. Enhancement of the MARC record is available through bibliographic utilities and various commercial vendors, but it is a separate and distinct service from that offered by the Library of Congress.

Similar parallels can be drawn between ISI and NTIS. In particular, NTIS has an important archival responsibility for government technical reports, whereas ISI only guarantees to provide articles for a limited period of time and primarily for those publications indexed or processed by ISI.

In the networking environment, many of the services are provided by the private sector, although primarily by not-for-profit agencies. These include both network organizations and bibliographic utilities.

Networking activities also provide an immediate interface between private/for-profit and private/not-for-profit agencies in terms of the services provided to libraries and users. Almost all of the equipment and hardware used to provide the services comes from one or more for-profit vendors; in some instances the supporting software has also been developed by vendors. An example of this is the Washington Library Network software developed by the Boeing Computer Services and the marketing of the WLN software by Bibliotechnics, a private, for-profit corporation.

These examples illustrate that it is not a question of whether we can work together, but one of how we can more effectively work together, recognizing the needs and requirements of each. It is not a matter simply of Federal government and private interaction, but of government services at all levels, Federal, state, and local, working together with private organizations to achieve networking goals

and objectives. The NCLIS report served as a point of departure for NAC's consideration of these issues.

The NCLIS report presented many difficulties for the Network Advisory Committee both in its general and philosophical premises as well as in its application to networking. It was difficult to see the differentiation between principles and recommendations, which seemed to overlap. Consequently, the advisory committee treated the principles and recommendations as if they were all operating at the same level, rather than regarding one as a subset of the other.

The issue that raised the most discussion and least agreement related to how information services are costed. It was recognized that there is not common agreement on definition of terms, let alone the methods, of costing to be used. Cost allocation remains more an art than a science, and matters of judgment must be exercised in deciding which elements of cost to include or exclude and how to allocate these among product and services. There seems to be no uniformity in the public and private sector in calculating costs, nor is there likely to be in the near future. The use within the Federal government of a common set of definitions and standards should promote some consistency at that level, but consistency between private and public sectors and among different institutions within the public sector is less certain. When two accountants cannot agree on which elements should be included, it is difficult to see how people who are less expert in this area can come to an agreement on such emotional issues.

These points are important and do need to be dealt with, but their resolution is probably going to occur outside the framework of networking activity and will take some time to resolve. In the interim, there are a number of steps that can be taken on which there is general agreement. The Network Advisory Committee prefers to focus on these recommendations.

The advisory committee found it easier to deal with and support individual recommendations rather than the principles. A summary of these appears in Appendix D. There was general agreement about recommendations 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 which involve use of technology, standards, education, research, and statistical data. In particular, the need for funding of research was highlighted as an overriding need for both public and private sectors and identified as an area in which the Federal government can play a major role, not only in providing a climate for encouraging research but also in funding for research projects.

Recommendation 8 on statistical data was strongly supported and emphasized in the concept paper prepared by Glyn Evans. One of his major comments concerned the lack of quantitative data in support of the recommendations in the NCLIS report.

The advisory committee also endorsed the recommendations relating to support for libraries in recommendations 12, 15, 25, and 27 and also principle 7. It supported recommendations 16, 17, and 19 related to participation by the private sector in planning and standards formulation. The committee also supported recommendations 23, 24, and 26 and principles 4 and 5 related to the access to information about reproduction and distribution of government information. While the advisory committee was in sympathy with a number of other recommendations and principles, there was concern about the ambiguity and the wording of some of the principles. The Network Advisory Committee recognized the extent to which the task force had worked to provide language that all members of the task force

could support, but the advisory committee was concerned about the ambiguity created in certain instances and preferred not to come out with an endorsement or support for these principles and recommendations.

The Network Advisory Committee also agreed to respond to NCLIS with specific recommendations over and above those recommendations related to the report itself. It recommended that:

- NCLIS should prepare an inventory of past and current projects that have demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of public and private sector interaction, identify what made those particular projects successful, and develop guidelines for promoting or funding similar projects in the future.

- NCLIS should review its existing reports, in particular, the results of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services, to identify potential projects which would promote and encourage public/private sector interaction.

- NAC will present a report to the profession at the various conferences on its activities and on this particular discussion.

- NAC will assemble the related information from its meeting and prepare a network planning paper with its concept paper and background information to encourage and promote discussion of the important issues raised in the NCLIS task force report.

The Network Advisory Committee's primary concern is to provide a positive climate for discussion that will promote exchange between the public and the private sector for the benefit of the entire information profession. We should not focus on those issues which are divisive but rather concentrate on those areas where we can, and have in the past, worked together and identify those areas in the future where mutual benefits can be achieved. This is no small task, particularly when economics underline much of the concerns between the two sectors and continue to provide divisive forces. Nonetheless, the advisory committee feels that the two groups will continue to co-exist and can work together. We need not stumble over the issue of economics but accept them, recognizing the limitations this may create and get on with the job we all have of providing access to information in a variety of ways that promote a free and open society.

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND READINGS

1. General

Hugh P. Donaghue, Implications of Transborder Data Flows to Library Networks. (IFLA Council, 1982). 7 p.

Forest Woody Horton, Jr., The Public Sector Role Controversy in Producing and Distributing Information Goods and Services. Discussion Draft. 14 p.

Dennis D. MacDonald and Jeffery L. Squires, Findings of the IFLA International Study on the Copyright of Bibliographic Records in Machine-readable Form. (IFLA Council, 1982). 19 p.

Patricia Glass Schuman, "Information Justice", Library Journal, June 1, 1982: 1060-1065.

2. Services

Carrollton Press. Information packet on REMARC.

Institute for Scientific Information. Information packet on OATS.

Library of Congress. Cataloging Distribution Service. Machine Readable Cataloging. 1981-82 MARC Services.

National Technical Information Service. General Catalog of Information Services, No. 7a. 1981 : 27.

National Technical Information Service. A Reference Guide to the NTIS Bibliographic Data Book. 1980 NTIS-PR-253.

APPENDIX B

A COMMENTARY ON THE NCLIS PUBLIC SECTOR/PRIVATE SECTOR TASK FORCE AND ITS REPORT

Presented by Robert M. Hayes
University of California, Los Angeles

(Reprinted, with Slight Modifications, from
Association of Research Libraries, Minutes of the
Ninety-Ninth Meeting, October 29-30, 1981, Washington, D.C.
Scholars' Access to Information:
Public Responsibility/Private Initiative)

The Public Sector/Private Sector Task Force was established by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in response to what had been a continuing debate on the relative roles of the public sector, especially of the Federal government and the private sector. The focus of our work must be made clear, since the title of the task force does not adequately define that focus. In fact, we were concerned totally with what we called "governmentally distributed information," but really federally distributed information. We used that term instead of the rather ambiguous one "government information," a term with which we struggled during almost the entire two years of our discussions.

It is important to recognize what is not covered in the work that we did, so I would like to go through a list of the issues that were not considered.

1. We were asked in the original charge to consider the assignment of responsibilities for various functions in the information transfer process to the several components of society: government, private industry, and the not-for-profit sector. But we concluded that that was not the proper way in which to deal with the issues involved, and that, in fact, assignment of responsibility for functions was totally inappropriate.

2. The implication of the charge was that we should consider government at all levels, but we did not. We focused our attention entirely on the Federal government.

3. In considering even government or governmentally distributable information itself, we limited our attention solely to that involved in the external distribution of information, not to the internal use of information within government.

4. The task force concentrated totally on government information resources, products, and services that are in the realm of commerce, i.e., that are disseminated by the Federal government either directly or through the private sector in a commercial manner, thus excluding those that are purely internal or administrative.

5. Although there clearly are areas of conflict within the private sector which are affected by government action (in the form of legislation, regulation, or even perhaps direct action), the task force did not consider such issues,

focusing its attentions totally on the impact of governmental information activities. Thus, issues related to private copyright conflicts, to conflicts between different private information activities, and to conflicts between the providers and the purchasers of information services were not considered unless they involved the government itself as a party to those conflicts.

6. The charge implied that the task force should consider how present situations might differ from the views that we suggested; however, the task force concluded that it could only make progress if it limited its consideration to activities that might arise in the future. The extent to which existing situations may or may not fit the principles we identified will need to be considered on an ad hoc basis, case by case. We did not attempt to resolve current issues.

7. The area of international data flow is one in which public sector/private sector interaction is clearly of immense importance, but the task force did not feel that it had sufficient expertise in its membership or time with which to cover the issues adequately. As a result, despite the importance with which the members of the task force regarded questions related to international data flow, the task force did not cover any of them in its principles or its recommendations.

8. Although the issues related to technology pervaded the entire deliberations of the task force, arising in virtually every item of discussion, in the final analysis the decision was made that the task force did not find it appropriate to present any recommendations or conclusions about technology as such.

I think it is important to recognize those boundary conditions because many of those things we did not include might have been in your mind as being encompassed by the term public sector/private sector interaction.

I would like to comment briefly about the nature of the task force itself. It was selected initially and continued throughout its deliberations to maintain a balance among three sectors of our economy--government, private industry (i.e., for-profit organizations), and not-for-profit organizations. And basically the membership was almost evenly divided among those three components of our society. The distribution of philosophical views concerning the role of government covered literally the complete spectrum, from those who would claim that the government should do nothing in the area of information distribution, literally nothing, to those who would regard the distribution of information as an essential function of government and that government should be able to make decisions to distribute information if it is in the public interest to do so. Between those two polar views would be virtually any other view of the relationship between the public sector and the private sector of which you can conceive.

I would like to make a personal comment, which does not reflect the task force in any sense, but my own observation as chairman. The private sector members of the task force were very articulate, very forceful, and had a very firm grasp of what they wished to accomplish. The public sector and not-for-profit members of the task force were somewhat less forceful, less articulate, and less in agreement on the values related to their concern. I think that the results may reflect that relative degree of ability to articulate and present views forcefully.

The work of the task force can be summarized in two statements, the first of them representing a point of unanimous agreement. (Really, from the very beginning it provided a driving force for our discussions and achieving consensus within the task force.) The second represented the focus of the major philosophical division in the task force.

First the point of agreement: it is an affirmation of the very context that led to establishing the task force in the first place. To quote from the report that we submitted to the National Commission:

> "Information resources, products, and services are vital components of our society, of our economic productivity, of our governmental operation, of our individual growth and well-being. They are increasing in their value and importance, however their role may be measured. Government activity should be designed to foster the development and use of information resources and to eliminate impediments to such development and use."

As will be summarized later, most of the principles identified by the task force, but especially Principles 1, 2, 5, and 7, reflect this view. They are each intended to identify guidelines for Federal policy that will support the development and use of information resources, products, and services.

Second, the focus of difference in philosophy and principle: there are basic differences in view concerning the proper role of the Federal government or of government in general with respect to providing information resources, products, and services. They result in conflicts between restricting and not restricting the role of government.

In the task force debate, those who would restrict the role of government would prefer to place reliance on the forces of the marketplace. Specifically, our society is founded on the traditional view that individual freedom and initiative expressed through competitive private enterprise are the best means for supplying the products and services needed by society and the best means for allocating resources. Government entry into the marketplace can have a chilling effect on private sector investment in the generation, collection, and distribution of information. When the government enters the marketplace, it interferes with the ability of the market mechanism to allocate resources to the optimum production of goods and services. The private sector, if not threatened by the anticompetitive effect of government in the marketplace, can widen the distribution of information from government as well as from other activities and thus increase the availability of information.

In contrast, those who would favor not restricting the role of government will point to the following: there is need to assure equitable, open access to the public in general to information that has been generated, collected, processed, and/or distributed by taxpayer funds. To participate fully in our democratic society, citizens must be informed and aware, regardless of their individual ability to pay for needed information. Information needs that are not served by the marketplace must be met by government. The government has a role to play in stimulating the development of information as a resource for dealing with societal problems. The remaining principles, primarily Principles 3, 4, and 6, and most of the task force's recommendations are concerned with means for resolving conflicts implied by this major difference in philosophical view.

In the discussion there was a variety of identifiable bases for conflict. And although these were never formally identified during the discussion, they were implicit in the discussion. In the report we included a brief schematic (see Table B-1 at the end of this appendix) which brought together most of the identifiable bases for conflict.

I hope that you will recognize that any schematic is going to be inaccurate in many respects and can hardly convey the full depth of the task force's discussions. But it does, I think, provide a useful framework. The first three issues relate to the governmental aspects of the conflicts. In particular, the function of government determines the range of conflict or the point in the range of conflict. If the function is constitutionally defined--national defense, for example, is a constitutionally defined activity, copyright is a constitutionally defined activity--the range of conflict is likely to be limited. If it is congressionally mandated, we are likely to have a moderate conflict. If it is agency-determined, the conflict is likely to be very high. I am not going to repeat what you can read more fully in the report. But, once again, the purpose of the information and the degree of availability of the information also determine the extent to which there will be conflict about the proper role of government versus the private sector.

The next set of issues relate essentially to the user or the usage made of the information: the audience; the ability of that audience to pay; the social value of the information (medical information, for example, presumably having high social value); the economic utility (not necessarily synonomous with economic value); the immediacy of value; and the extent to which the resources, products, and services are user-specific. This last issue was very crucial in the task force deliberations. As the government moves from creating information as a resource, to distribution of it as a product, and then to providing tailored services, we are moving from highly generalized services to increasing specificity in the services.

The final set of bases for conflict relate to the processes by which the information is made available, represented in particular and for example by the amount of value added. If we are dealing simply with the generation of and processing of information, the conflict is likely to be limited. But as we move to compilation of information and collection of it from a variety of sources (including, in particular, private sector sources), the conflict increases. As we move to the packaging of information and providing direct services--in particular marketing them--the conflict becomes high.

The form of availability turns out to be a basis of conflict. If we are dealing with print or even with microform, the conflict, at least in the task force discussions, was fairly limited. But as we moved to computer-processable data, and more particularly to online access, the conflict became very, very great. Pricing policy and the existence of private sector services, either presently or potentially, were both sources of conflict. And, finally, and in many of the discussions most importantly, the source of the information represents a basis for conflict. If it is collected from the public, there may be moderate conflict, represented by the issue of what questions should be included in the census, for example. If it is obtained from private sources, the conflict is likely to be very high. This schematic gives you a very rapid picture of the kinds of issues with which we struggled.

Now let me turn to the findings of the task force, represented by a set of principles and, then, related recommendations. I am not going to go into the full

detail of the recommendations, but I do want to give you the text of the principles. In general, they are quite consistent with each other and quite consistent with the set of objectives.

The first objective means that we were in favor of open access--and we used the words "open access" very carefully meaning without essential limitations on the availability, not "freely available," because that might imply at no cost--open access to information generated by the Federal government and in favor of reliance upon libraries and private-sector organizations, both for-profit and not-for-profit, to make readily available the information that can be distributed by the Federal government.

The view of the task force is that these two sets of institutions, taken together, provide the best means for insuring public access to governmentally distributable information. On the one hand, the use of libraries, especially public and academic libraries, assures that ability to pay does not raise barriers which effectively and discriminatively deny access to information. On the other hand, the use of private-sector organizations, entrepreneurs in the business of providing information services, insures that individual freedom and initiative will be dedicated to developing and marketing a multiplicity of information services whose value is determined by the purchasers rather than by the government. The principles and recommendations emphasize the importance of using this balance--libraries and the private sector entrepreneurs--as means for access, especially in contrast to creating new Federal agencies to do so. The principles are in favor of a leadership role for government rather than a management role, and of limiting direct government intervention in the marketplace.

Now I would like to give you a very quick review of the principles; the related recommendations are spelled out in detail in the report.

Principle No. 1: The Federal government should take a leadership role in creating a framework that would facilitate the development and foster the use of information products and services.

The recommendations related to this principle specify several areas in which government can provide leadership: enhancing the competitive forces of the marketplace; affirming the application of the First Amendment; providing legislative consistency; using efficient technologies; and supporting education, research, and data collection in this field.

Principle No. 2: The Federal government should establish and enforce policies and procedures that encourage, and do not discourage, investment by the private sector in the development and use of information products and services.

The six recommendations presented as means for implementing this principle relate to encouragement of new developments, reducing uncertainties, and reducing risks, especially as may be represented by the threat of government entry into the marketplace.

Principle No. 3: The Federal government should not provide information products and services in commerce except when there are compelling reasons to do so, and then only when it protects

the private sector's every opportunity to assume the functions commercially.

Principle 3 really gets to the core of the problem with which we were concerned, and I would like to comment on some words in this statement. "Compelling reasons" is obviously a content-free term. The issue, of course, was not what are compelling reasons, since, in fact, we had no means of coming to agreement on what is public good or not public good or what are reasons that government ought to provide or not provide information services. We used the term "compelling reasons" rather than "public good" precisely to point out that we cannot answer that question. But it is answerable by a process, so the key point is that process by which the issue of "compelling reasons" can be resolved. The recommendations related to this principle outline a series of steps for determining that there indeed are "compelling reasons" for the government to provide services in commerce:

- Announce intentions, review and approve any plans before implementation; do so soon enough so that the nongovernmental activities have the opportunity to respond to them.
- Provide an "information impact and cost analysis" as part of the process of review, evaluation, and approval.
- Review periodically.
- Do not arbitrarily restrict the Federal government from enhancement of information products and services.
- Conduct a periodic economic assessment of the impact of Federal government information products and services.

The fourth principle is really directly related to the same set of principles.

Principle No. 4: The Federal government, when it uses, reproduces, or distributes information available from the private sector as part of an information resource, product, or service, must assure that the property rights of the private-sector sources are adequately protected.

To me, Principles, 5, 6, and 7 are perhaps the most important principles and recommendations.

Principle No. 5: The Federal government should make governmentally distributable information openly available in readily reproducible form without any constraints on subsequent use.

Principle No. 6: The Federal government should set pricing policies for distributing information products and services that reflect the true cost of access and/or reproduction, any specific prices to be subject to review by an independent authority.

Of course, we recognized the problems in determining true cost, but they were problems which we were totally unprepared to resolve. That is an accounting problem, not a policy problem. The key point is that the prices for Federal government information should not be set in terms of market-oriented criteria,

should not be set in terms of making a profit or even paying for the costs of creating the information in the first place. They should be priced at a level that will encourage external use of the data.

Principle No. 7: The Federal government should actively use existing mechanisms such as the libraries of the country as primary channels for making governmentally distributable information available to the public.

The report was submitted on August 8. . . . I do have a couple of personal comments I would like to make. They represent concerns on my own part, and I am going to take the opportunity of this forum to express these concerns. The first relates to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. It gave to the Office of Management and Budget an extent of power over distribution of governmental information that, frankly, frightens me. And I want to record that with you. My comment is directly related to the issues with which the task force was concerned during its deliberations. We found in the Paperwork Reduction Act the embodiment of many of our recommendations. And so my concern is not with the substance of the Paperwork Reduction Act but with the extent of power that has been placed, essentially in one agency, by it.

The second concern relates to the general approach that calls for the government to have "cost recovery," because the effect of that is, by the very nature of cost recovery, to put the government into the marketplace; that is where the real problems have arisen. When the government functions as though it were a private, entrepreneurial organization in the marketplace for the purpose of making money, even if only for the purpose of cost recovery, I find that to be very distressing. What will happen is either to eliminate the availability of government information through government sources or to put the government into the competitive position that has been of such concern to the private sector, and properly of concern.

TABLE B-1

Schematic of Contexts for Conflict
Concerning the Role of the Federal Government
in Providing Information Resources, Products, & Services

Context	Range of Conflict: Limited	Moderate	High
Function of Government	Constitutionally defined	Congressionally mandated	Agency determined
Purpose of Information	Internal work of government	Educate or inform public	Influence policy
Degree of Availability	"Freedom of Information Act"	Sup't of Documents	Heavily marketed
Audience	General public	Specific groups	Limited groups
Ability to Pay	Economically disadvantaged	General public	Business and industry
Social Value	High social value	Moderate social value	Low social value
Economic utility	Low utility	Moderate utility	High utility
Immediacy of Value	Long-term value	Medium-term value	Immediate-term value
User Specificity	Resources	Products	Services
Amount of Value added	Generation & processing	Compilation & collection	Packaging & direct services
Form of Availability	Print, Microform	Computer readable tapes	Online access, Broadcast
Pricing Policy	Congressional subsidy	Marginal cost of reproduction	Market based pricing
Existing Services	No overlap to minor overlap	Minor overlap to some overlap	Major overlap to competitive
Source of Information	Generated internally	Collected from public	Obtained from private sources

APPENDIX C

A DISCUSSION PAPER PRESENTED TO THE NETWORK ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC SECTOR/PRIVATE SECTOR TASK FORCE REPORT

Prepared by Glyn T. Evans
SUNY Central Administration

PREAMBLE

The NCLIS task force report is both wide-ranging in its scope and far-reaching in its implications. The task of producing the report must have been extremely difficult given the circumstances and timing of the work, and the task force and Chairman Hayes must be thanked and congratulated for coming to some closure on the complex issues which they addressed. If the report is not totally accepted for action, at least the problems and constituencies are well identified and described. A record of the conditions and perspectives of a broad spectrum of the information community at the start of the ninth decade of the century such as that provided by this document is a valuable and permanent contribution to society.

INTRODUCTION

As I interpreted the charge, it is my function to discuss those aspects of the report which directly relate to the work of the Network Advisory Committee and the development of library networks. It is not my function to review the entire report. Nonetheless, I have some severe criticisms to make of the report prior to discussion. I hope that the criticisms are constructive and help set, or perhaps narrow, the stage for subsequent discussion.

Seldom have I seen a report that is so wide-reaching in its proposals and in the effects of implementation which is so totally devoid of supporting data. One looks in vain for answers to quantitative questions, such as how much, how many, how often, how expensive, how cheap? Presumably the committee had access to some data; but apart from the bibliography there are no references to supporting data or to reports of studies undertaken by the task force. It may well be that there were anecdotal or experiential data available to the task force, equally valid of course, but still not shared. The NCLIS task force recognizes this lack in recommending that data be gathered "to deal with information policy issues."

Absence of data indicates that the task force reached closure through the careful choice of language and through compromise and improved understanding of opposing viewpoints rather than by the illumination and appreciation of conditions by study and analysis. Indeed the report states that "this group argued its way across the complicated landscape of information policy issues." Speaking in St. Paul, Minn., Chris Burns, a member of the task force, reported that all three sectors represented on the task force (public, private, and Federal government) "did not understand each other well," although during the work (which took two years to complete), the group did come closer to understanding. Obviously, contributions to the discussion and appreciation of the issues were as influenced by one's view of the role of government in society as by data or experience.

It is already apparent that discussion of the report will follow the same pattern, with idealogues at each end of the spectrum staking out ground from which to contribute to the debate. This, of course, is healthy and a welcome affirmation of the strength and wit of democratic society. One must observe, however, the rather grim irony of a crucial debate on the future of the "Information Society" being held in the almost total absence of information.

Some issues and factors were left unexamined or unrecognized by the report. Examples are definitions of "information" and related assumptions about information as a resource; serious speculation on developing information technologies and their effects; the international aspects of information; detailed descriptions of, and recommendations about, the not-for-profit information sector, which can range from the Chemical Abstracts Service to OCLC to local library consortia; and the accelerating rate of change in society where technology is forcing issues well before society has developed the social mechanisms to deal with them. (The present report is itself a valiant example of society's attempts to deal with an amorphous problem about which it has vague unease but has neither adequate methodology, theory, nor data to produce a satisfactory solution.) It will be difficult to ignore some of these elements in discussing the report and its relation to library networks. Complexity will not disappear through inattention.

It is also necessary to note that the library, as an institution, is the one sector which must be the most responsive to changing technology but the one which will be the hardest to change. The very difference of missions and goals, constituencies, funding sources, geography, and professional expectations make it extremely difficult to direct or predict adequate response. This situation contrasts sharply with the well-directed efforts of the private sector and the cohesiveness of government. Library networks have been the premier catalyst for library change in the last decade; will, can, and should this continue for the next decade, given the technological and fiscal imperatives which face the library?

I suggest that one mechanism with which to focus this discussion is to concentrate on the economic issues. Some methods of information distribution and access are presumably more cost-effective in narrow terms and more cost-beneficial in broad societal terms than others. Some kinds of information are presumably more efficiently and beneficially distributed one way than another. All parties--government, private sector, and the library community--have constituencies to which they are responsible for both the provision of service (goods/processes) and economic efficiency (maybe survival). The conference at St. Paul was well named "A Question of Balance"; without being too naive, I propose that it is more a question of economic rather than political or ethical balance.

In this paper, therefore, I concentrate on the economic aspects of those recommendations which affect a library network.

THE LIBRARY NETWORK AS A COMPONENT OF THE NOT-FOR-PROFIT SECTOR

The report in its first definition of sectors defines the Public Sector and the Private Sector as follows:

> PUBLIC SECTOR. This term is taken to include government and, more specifically, Federal government. Agencies, like public

libraries or public universities that are tax-supported, even though non-governmental in character, are included.

PRIVATE SECTOR. This term is taken to include private enterprises, for-profit and not-for-profit, as well as organizations such as professional societies and trade associations, hybrids that are joint government/private enterprise, and organizations such as privately supported libraries and universities (even though they may be subsidized by public funds).

It then recognized "the ambiguous position of the third sector organizations (universities, libraries, research institutes, professional societies)." While the report was not able to resolve this ambiguity, it does continue by expanding the definitions into a three-sector division as follows:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE. Organizations in the private sector, in business for the purpose of making a profit.

NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. Organizations, both public and private (such as universities, libraries, professional societies and trade associations, non-profit research institutes, etc.), that provide non-governmental services, but without the purpose of making a profit from doing so.

GOVERNMENT. Federal, state, and local government, including legislative, executive, judicial, and independent agencies performing the functions in governing the society.

It will be noted that library networks and bibliographic utilities are not specifically identified as members of the not-for-profit sector. (When I discussed this informally with a task force member, he could not recall any discussion of the role of networks during the meetings.)

The bibliographic networks as we recognize them today were founded and developed as the result of specific stimuli. The first was the evidence of need. Important economic studies such as the papers in Libraries at Large,1/ and later expressions of that work, e.g., Baumol and Marcus on the Economics of Academic Libraries,2/ brought wider realization of the need to change techniques.

As important as the recognition of need was the recognition of opportunity. The principal opportunity was surely provided by the Library of Congress with its pioneering development of automation, from the King report (1972) 3/ through the early MARC experiments to the distribution of MARC II tapes commencing in 1969. Of course, the concurrent computer, telecommunications, peripheral equipment, and software industrial developments were critical, but it is difficult to claim that, in the first instance, they were designed for the library or information dissemination marketplace. One remembers the initiative of the American Library Association in the development of the upper and lowercase print chain. Another later example is development by OCLC of the Beehive 100 terminal, another initiative in not-for-profit response to a failure in the private enterprise sector.

The vision and leadership which the Library of Congress provided in developing the formats, working within the international community, and distributing its authoritative data were critical to the survival of libraries in the

following decade, but one notices that its work was built upon by the not-for-profit sector, that is the networks and individual libraries such as the New York Public Library, Stanford University, University of Chicago, and a couple of state libraries. The development in the early stages was largely ignored by the private sector. It is interesting to observe that over time, the Library of Congress was not able to sustain its contribution of authoritative bibliographic data. It is still viewed as the authority, but lack of funding and the sheer volume of titles needing to be cataloged as libraries and networks grew have overwhelmed it. (Of 7.26 million records on the OCLC file, 16% or 1.159 million are from Library of Congress.) The resulting problems in data input quality have exercised the library network community ever since, with a huge effort being made in data remediation by libraries, networks, and the Library of Congress itself. Would increased government funding to support the Library of Congress and perhaps other "authoritative" libraries to be prime data producers be a wise investment for society? Or is this an area into which private enterprise could and should step? Clearly the present mode is wasteful overall of human resource.

The development of the three major bibliographic networks in the U.S. is an interesting study since in their various ways, all have been built primarily by public funds, either through Federal, state, or private foundation grants. Their continuation, however, has depended on the sale of services to their member libraries, and their governance and control have remained in Boards of Trustees drawn largely from members. The same is largely true of the regional and local networks which may be affiliated with a nationwide utility or may be providing purely local or statewide services. The role of direct Federal and statewide funding is diminishing, and libraries are increasing their expenditures on networks.

Perhaps the more significant aspect of the library expenditure is not the maintenance of the network through the purchase of service but the contribution to research and development. As I noted elsewhere the bibliographic utilities have become important research engines in bibliographic development. (They are not unique in this, of course; major abstracting and indexing data producers such as the Chemical Abstracts Service and Biological Abstracts perform the same research function in a parallel arena.) The library contribution to research is not unconscious. It is active in its contribution of advice regarding developments and expectant regarding results, whether the result is a new system, a new technical development, or a data base activity. The important element for this discussion is that again, apart from individual consultants and conversations with vendors, the development generally does not include private enterprise. One other important development is the expansion of network membership to include libraries of for-profit institutions, a new component, and recognized as both a growth area and an important contributor of bibliographic wealth. Their participation is both blurring of difference and leavening of expectation.

If the three major networks began, and continue, as not-for-profit groups (along with their regional and local affiliates), technical and market developments have assured that they are not the only network developers. Since the mid-1970s, private entrepreneurs, perhaps most noticeably C L Systems, Inc., have developed library circulation systems which have the capacity to serve many libraries in a region, can be linked together to create a network, and can be expanded to provide an online catalog. Further, they can be fed through local data derived in machine-readable form from the bibliographic utilities, either through the terminal or tapes. Once bought and installed, however, these become tools used and controlled by not-for-profit groups to serve their social purposes. Insofar as the manufacturer

continues research and development investment, it is probably not to provide "network" services but to increase the attractiveness of the product for local groups wishing to establish a "network."

One additional group which is growing in recognition is the vendor of microcomputer software which can be used independently to provide word processing and analytic services and as terminals to access bibliographic and other data bases.

Access to abstracting and indexing data bases has grown in a different way. First, the data bases themselves were not necessarily viewed as the end product by the manufacturers; rather they were the means to the production of printed products. Indeed when approached by computing centers for access to the data, some vendors had a great deal of difficulty in assessing the value and the price to be paid for copies of the data base. The major abstracting and indexing data base producers in the early pioneering days were primarily (although not exclusively) governmental or not-for-profit groups such as the National Library of Medicine, Chemical Abstracts Service, or Biosciences Information Service (BIOSIS), and as stated, the data bases supported printed products. NLM led the way in providing access to machine-readable files through SUNY's Biomedical Communication Network and MEDLINE. But very quickly, private enterprise saw the opportunity to access the same or other files. This led to the development of Lockheed's Dialog service, the System Development Corporation, and the Bibliographic Retrieval Service, whose function is to provide computer access and generalized software which can access a variety of files. Other private specialized systems exist, such as LEXIS for law materials.

Much of the controversy in the NCLIS task force report concerns the access to government produced data bases when the government provides the access to its own data base and the development of services by government which challenge similar services already available. Examples of both groups are given on pages 79-81 of the report. (The National Institute of Mental Health case is an interesting example of the absence of additional information. One immediately asks what constitutes the forty percent of unique material in NIMH? Is it rejected by Psychological Abstracts; is it published in journals not indexed by Psychological Abstracts; what unique material in Psychological Abstracts is not indexed by NIMH; how timely are the respective data bases, and so on?)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NETWORKS

The important focus in this section is not a review of the past but an understanding of the forces which have forced network development. It is important to understand the degree of confluence that is taking place, can be expected to take place in the near future, and may continue through the next decade.

A. Now

1. Their membership has spread from exclusive access from the public sector to libraries in for-profit institutions. This is still a minority group (and will continue to be so under IRS understandings), but it is an important group which brings with it a different understanding of the value and price of information. As stated by one

special librarian, "I can't provide much original information from my library, but I am anxious to pay for what I get."

2. Reduced funding from government and foundations has created a cooperative, mutually dependent partnership between libraries and networks with libraries (users) knowingly paying for research and development and contributing to its management.

3. The libraries have gained an appreciation of the value of the asset of the massive data bases which they have built cooperatively and the telecommunications infrastructure which they support in order to access that data base.

4. A more "business-like" approach by bibliographic utilities, regional networks, and participating libraries has taken place, with a hardening of the decision process following the tightening of "soft" money.

5. The need to strengthen quality control of the data base through joint efforts, research and development in authority file control, and support for Library of Congress has been recognized.

6. Expansion of horizons of service into additional systems and services, from non-roman character sets to online catalogs to distributed systems, has taken place.

7. Competition among the utilities has been recognized.

B. Near Term

1. Development of offline products from data bases, e.g., union lists of serials.

2. Continuation of joint work on authority files and the development of online catalogs.

3. Exploitation of the telecommunication networks through such projects as OCLC's Gateway (which has the potential of interfacing with private sector data base services).

4. Recognition of excellence in cataloging in certain institutions in an effort to expand the authority and quality of bibliographic data bases.

5. Rapid expansion of the use of microcomputers as very intelligent terminals spawning a vast variety of local systems and services, perhaps expanding beyond the library to the laboratory or the home.

6. Development of distributed systems by the bibliographic utilities to provide local services such as circulation, online catalogs, etc., so that the systems will be linked as an integral part of the main bibliographic networks.

7. Expansion of interfaces between not-for-profit utilities and private enterprise systems for circulation and other services.

8. Improved management information services pulling together data from a variety of sectors into coherent systems.

9. Electronic interface between not-for-profit utilities and private enterprise jobbers, vendors, and publishers.

C. Long Term

1. Attempts to cope with electronic publishing on demand, electronic document delivery, and videotext. For example, the introduction by the Library of Congress of videodisk storage of its catalog could have consequences on the services provided by the utilities.

2. Continued expansion to the international community, conceivably resulting in twenty-four hour service in the U.S. and further expansion of the data base.

3. Additional attempts to enhance the range and quality of data bases through the deliberate stimulus of selecting collections for retrospective conversion and the development of by-products from the bases.

ECONOMICS OF LIBRARY NETWORKS

It is generally accepted that the purpose of library networks is to improve the cost effectiveness of operations of both individual participants and the group as a whole. The network does this in two ways: first, by lowering the direct cost of a specific function, e.g., cataloging a book; and second, by improving the utilization of bibliographic, human, spatial, and fiscal resources. This is not different from the function of a library within its community but merely an extension of the purpose to a larger environment.

It has been well demonstrated that networks are successful in achieving these goals. Many studies of libraries have shown reduced costs, shifting of personnel, reduced backlogs, and other benefits over and above the fiscal and social costs of instituting change. The change in regional network operations, for example, when early workers were almost missionaries, to the present almost unsolicited movement of libraries to networks, demonstrates acceptance.

Two problems are presented. First, while it is relatively easy to demonstrate reduced cost, we lack an adequate economic model to assess the value of improved service. This is true of libraries as well as of networks. This is more than an operational inconvenience. In times of challenge, a well-ordered, well-disciplined group, such as the private sector, with a clear target and firm expectations can seize the initiative. The government and public sectors have goals of service which remain vaguely stated in economic terms. Unless and until libraries and networks can make clear economic value statements and establish goals in clear economic terms, they will be disadvantaged in any conflict over turf.

The second problem is that it is difficult to see clearly how the new technology (videotext, electronic publishing on demand, electronic document delivery, etc.) will affect the operation and function of many libraries. (Clearly the effects and the degree of acceptance will be a direct function of its community.) But to what degree will or can the library be bypassed? How will libraries respond? What effect will this have on the economics of libraries? And on the economics of networks? How will the roles and the economic raison d'etre of networks change as the economics of information access and delivery change?

Both of these problems are rich areas for research and discovery; and there may yet be time to find answers.

THE FUTURE NETWORK IN RELATION TO THE TASK FORCE REPORT

It is proposed that the future network will be:

An online catalog, which links
bibliographic,
publishing (including electronic and publishing on demand),
disciplinary,
abstracting and indexing, and
holdings and inventory information,

all of which are developed and maintained by a
mixture of service providers drawn from all
three sectors, each working through economic
self interest to mutual economic advantage.

Users of the "catalog" will have access to a variety of
supporting services such as ordering, printing, and
interlibrary loan through the same mechanism.

If that view can be accepted as a working definition for the purpose of this paper, how will selected principles and recommendations from the NCLIS task force report help or hinder development?

Recommendation 1. Information Environment: Given an increased recognition of the value of information, government may need to stimulate its dissemination. The economic question is how should the government enhance the activity? In some cases by direct distribution, in others by subsidy (enhancement of competitive forces). The user's search for information through a network could lead to either source, and probably the user doesn't care. Need will supersede doctrine. The user just wants the best service he can get. In other words, the information needed will change the mode of delivery.

Recommendation 4. Use of Technology: Of course, but it is true of all levels of public sector activity not just at the Federal government level. There are competing

views within the sector of the appropriate loci of responsibility and initiative. It is important not to underestimate the questions of turf.

Recommendation 5. Standards: Absolutely essential at the national and international level. The negative tone "will not inhibit" is curious; "will encourage" is preferable language.

Recommendations 6-7. Education and Research: Again absolutely essential. It is a tragedy that with a few honourable exceptions, the library schools have lost the initiative during the past decade. Educational needs go beyond the organizer of information to the user (or under-user) of information. Loss of Federal and state research funds is also a tragedy. Some competitive sources, e.g., Title IIa of the Higher Education Act, had a splendid record of objectivity and success which are almost a model of government stimulus through research support.

Recommendations 8-9. Statistics and Management Data: The burden of this paper is precisely that there are not enough data to make informed decisions. Data are becoming more available as a by-product of the use of machine-readable files; but there remains the serious question of the degree of acceptance of (or amount of fear generated by) accurate management information within organizations. It is possible to hold the view that improved management of a library or network through access to better management data is one of the most important benefits that can be derived from network use.

Recommendations 10-11. The view of this paper is that the issues are the economic questions of cost-benefit, not doctrine. The value of the information will be determined by the users and the use to which it is put, not the mode of its distribution.

Recommendation 12. Yes.

Recommendations 14-15. An interesting example of "added-value" in the network environment is the use and re-use made of Library of Congress MARC tapes by subscribers in networks and individual libraries. Here, the provision of processing services to allow local adoption and re-use is the fundamental activity, and this meets the expectations which Library of Congress had when it commenced the distribution service. Networks would also probably accept incentives to expand their activities where appropriate.

Recommendations 19-23.

Even if one accepts the principle, the definitions of "compelling reasons" are very difficult. There is no language in these recommendations which suggest that the efficiency of the private sector should also be reviewed although the question is raised in the discussion (p. 67 of the NCLIS task force report). One assumes that the government would let a bid or that contract renewal would be the basis for such review. A specific recommendation would have restored some semblance of balance.

Recommendation 23 is rather begrudging in its tone and intent. In the network environment, it is easy to identify examples where the government should be actively encouraged to expand and enhance its information products. If the Library of Congress could speed and expand its cataloging activities, for example, the cost beneficial effects would immediately be felt by many libraries.

Recommendations 24-27.

In terms of library networking these recommendations are acceptable; the value of the online catalog proposed in this section would be diminished by the absence of government data. There is some danger in recommendations 24 and 25 if it is assumed that "no charge" is "no cost." Deposit of and access to documents and access to catalogs incur expenses which would be intolerable for a local library or network unless operational support is offered. Recommendation 27 can only be implemented within the capacity of the existing infrastructure to absorb an additional workload. There is, however, economic reason to expect that it is cheaper to expand an existing organization than to create a new one.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The NCLIS task force report is an important contribution to the discussions on information policy. Many of the recommendations are unexceptionable. It does enunciate some "principles" that are controversial, which in their wording and intent represent the prevalence of a disciplined market viewpoint within the task force. The not-for-profit sector and library networks were barely accounted for by the task force. Its deliberations in the end focused almost exclusively on the right of the private sector to publish government information when it wishes to.

The government is a massive producer of information, and for the ultimate user, timeliness, accuracy, and cost efficiency of distribution and access are the primary criteria of acceptance, not who undertakes the task. It is not possible from the report to make accurate judgments about the merits of any claim given the lack of supporting data (which the report itself recognizes in one of its recommendations).

The responsibility of a network, however, is to provide access to as many sectors and sources of information as possible as cost effectively as possible. The user, through selection of information sources, will be the ultimate judge of the efficiency of information distribution and will, through choice, determine the range and scope of network services.

Important though the report is, it is difficult to accept that adoption of the principles it poses is the central issue which faces society as it moves further into the information age. Many of its recommendations will, if implemented, improve the understanding and efficiency of information access and distribution, through networks where economically appropriate. The central issues of understanding fully the information economy remain and demand urgent attention.

REFERENCES

1/ Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse, Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and the National Interest; the Resource Book Based on Materials of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. (New York: Bowker, 1969). 664 p.

2/ William J. Baumol and Matityahu Marcus, Economics of Academic Libraries; Prepared for Council on Library Resources by Mathematica, Inc. (Washington: American Council on Education, 1973). 98 p.

3/ Gilbert W. King and others, Automation and the Library of Congress; A Survey Sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Washington: Library of Congress). 88 p.

APPENDIX D

NAC ACTIONS ON NCLIS TASK FORCE REPORT

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
Principle 1. The Federal government should take a leadership role in creating a framework that would facilitate the development and foster the use of information products and services.		
	Recommendation 1. Provide an environment that will enhance the competitive forces of the private sector so that the market mechanisms can be effective in allocating resources in the use of information and in directing innovation into market determined areas.	
	Recommendation 2. Affirm the applicability of the First Amendment to information products and services.	Uncertain of applicability
	Recommendation 3. Encourage Congress to be consistent in the language used and in the application of principles relating to information products and services such as those identified in this report, when it formulates legislation and when it exercises its oversight role.	
	Recommendation 4. Encourage government agencies to utilize the most efficient (information) technologies.	Support

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
	Recommendation 5. Encourage the setting and use of voluntary standards that will not inhibit the further development of innovative information products and services.	Support
	Recommendation 6. Encourage and support educational programs that provide the professional skills needed to further the development and use of information as an economic and social resource.	Support
	Recommendation 7. Encourage and support both basic and applied research in library and information science.	Support
	Recommendation 8. Encourage and support statistical programs and related research to provide the data needed to deal with information policy issues.	Support
	Recommendation 9. Conduct a periodic economic assessment of the impact of Federal government information products and services.	
	Recommendation 10. Encourage Federal agencies to regard the dissemination of information, especially through the mechanisms of the private sector (both for-profit and not-for-profit), as a high priority responsibility.	
	Recommendation 11. Identify and evaluate alternatives to existing federal information dissemination mechanisms.	

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
	Recommendation 12. Develop and support the use of libraries as active means for access to governmental information by the public.	Support
Principle 2. The Federal government should establish and enforce policies and procedures that encourage and do not discourage, investment by the private sector in the development and use of information products and services.		
	Recommendation 13. Identify and eliminate legal and regulatory barriers to the introduction of new information products and services.	
	Recommendation 14. Encourage private enterprise to "add value" to government information (i.e., to repackage it, provide further processing services, and otherwise enhance the information so that it can be sold at a profit).	
	Recommendation 15. Provide incentives to existing organizations such as libraries and bookstores, that will encourage them to expand their activities in dissemination of governmentally distributable information.	Support

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
	Recommendation 16. Establish procedures which will create a realistic opportunity for private sector involvement in the planning process for government information activities.	Support
	Recommendation 17. Involve the private sector in the process of formulating standards relating to Federal information activities.	Support
	Recommendation 18. Create or improve mechanisms for ensuring that the actions of government agencies, in developing information resources, products, and services, are consistent with the policies, goals, and long-range plans that are announced.	
Principle 3. The Federal government should not provide information products and services in commerce except when there are compelling reasons to do so, and then only when it protects the private sector's every opportunity to assume the function(s) commercially.		
	Recommendation 19. Announce intentions sufficiently ahead of time to provide an opportunity for private sector involvement when a government agency, for reasons it regards as compelling, should plan to develop and/or market an information product or service.	Support

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
	Recommendation 20. Review and approve, before implementation, any plans for the government to develop and/or market an information product or service, the review to be carried out by an agency appropriate to the branch of government (such as OMB, GAO, CBO).	
	Recommendation 21. Include an "Information impact and cost analysis" as part of the process of review, evaluation, and approval of any plans for the government to develop and/or to market an information product or service, the analysis to cover economic and social effects, effects on existing products and services, effects on potential private sector products and services, and benefits to the public.	
	Recommendation 22. Review periodically to evaluate the desirability of continuation of any information product or service as a governmental activity.	
	Recommendation 23. Do not arbitrarily restrict the Federal government from enhancement of information products and services, even if solely to meet the needs of constituencies outside the government itself.	Support

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
Principle 4. The Federal government when it uses, reproduces, or distributes information available from the private sector as part of an information resource, product, or service, must assure that the property rights of the private sector sources are adequately protected.		Support
Principle 5. The Federal government should make governmentally distributable information openly available in readily reproducible form, without any constraints on subsequent use.		Support
	Recommendation 24. Announce the availability of governmentally distributable information and maintain one or more registers to help the public determine what governmentally distributable information is available.	Support
	Recommendation 25. Deposit governmentally distributable information, in whatever form it may be available, at national and regional centers, including regional depository libraries, where it may be examined at no charge.	Support
	Recommendation 26. Do not assert any Federal government copyrights on information the Federal government makes domestically available.	Support

NCLIS Principles	NCLIS Recommendations	NAC Recommendations
Principle 6. The Federal government should set pricing policies for distributing information products or services that reflect the true cost of access and/or reproduction, any specific prices to be subject to review an independent authority.		
Principle 7. The Federal government should actively use existing mechanisms such as the libraries of the country, as primary channels for making governmentally distributable information available to the public.		Support
	Recommendation 27. Use the nation's libraries and non-governmental information centers as means for distribution of governmentally distributable information instead of creating new governmental units or expanding existing ones.	Support

GPO 902-460

OTHER NETWORK PLANNING PAPERS

No. 1 Butler, Brett. A Nationwide Location Data Base and Service. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1978). 66 p.

No. 2 Dataflow Systems. A Glossary for Library Networking. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1978). 34 p.

No. 3 Buchinski, Edwin J. Initial Considerations for a Nationwide Data Base. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1978). 56 p.

No. 4 Network Technical Architecture Group. Message Delivery System for the National Library and Information Service Network: General Requirements. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1978). 35 p.

No. 5 Long, Philip L. Study of Message Text Formats: Bibliographic Search Queries. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1979). 28 p.

No. 6 Vondran, Raymond F., 1946- National Union Catalog Experience: Implications for Network Planning. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1980). 51 p.

No. 7 Document Delivery--Background Papers Commissioned by the Network Advisory Committee. (Washington, Library of Congress, 1982). various pagings.

Available from the Customer Services Section, Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20541.